

## REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending. The Applicants are herein amending claims 1, 4, 5, 14, 17, 18, 22, 26-28 and 30.

In an Office action dated April 20, 2005, claims 1-30 were finally rejected. The Applicants responded to that Office action on July 20, 2005 with various amendments and remarks. In response, the Examiner mailed an Advisory Action on August 5, 2005, maintaining the final rejection.

Thus, the Applicants are herein filing a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR § 1.114. In light of the amendments herein, as well as the previous response (which was entered, as indicated in the Advisory Action), the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and allow this application.

The Applicants have amended the claims to more distinctly define the claimed invention. In particular, each of the independent claims 1, 14, and 22 now each recite, in part: "... receiving ... via a wireless communication channel, a compact availability data set ... wherein the availability data set includes concise generic indicators to indicate at least one of free space in an attendee's schedule and busy space in an attendee's schedule, thereby enabling efficient transmission over the wireless communication channel." Also, independent claim 28 now recites, in part: "a server ... adapted to ... transmit to the wireless scheduling device via a wireless communication channel, a compact availability data set ... wherein the availability data set includes concise generic indicators to indicate at least one of free space in an attendee's schedule and busy space in an attendee's schedule, thereby enabling efficient transmission over the wireless communication channel."

Thus, the claimed invention employs a “compact availability data set” that includes concise generic indicators of an attendee’s schedule (e.g., free space and/or busy space). As explained in the Applicants’ specification: “A benefit of the concise nature of the information in the availability data set is the ease with which such information may be communicated over the relatively slow data communication channels associated with wireless devices.” (page 6, lines 22-24 of Applicants’ Specification). In short, communicating data intensive information over a wireless communication channel is not trivial, which explains the current lack of data intensive services provided for wireless devices today. For instance, there are currently no products on the market that are capable of determining availability of a set of attendees using a wireless scheduling device, as recited in the Applicants’ claims. The Applicants have overcome this problem by recognizing, among other things, that availability data can be transmitted in a concise form, from which attendee availability can then be derived and displayed at the wireless device.

One specific implementation to further improve efficiency of the data transmission via the wireless communication channel is recited in the Applicants’ dependent claims 5, 18, and 26, each of which recites, in part: “... wherein the compact availability data set includes generically indicated free-busy information for the set of attendees as a group, as opposed to free-busy information for individual attendees.” (e.g., see also Applicants’ Specification, page 6, line 25 to page 7 line 1).

The Applicants have reviewed the references of record (including Conmy, Schuster, and Rubert), and can find no disclosure or suggestion (whether considering the references alone or in combination) to use or otherwise exploit a compact availability data set that includes concise generic indicators to indicate free and/or busy space in an attendee’s

schedule, thereby enabling efficient transmission over a wireless communication channel, as recited in the Applicants claims 1-30. Nor can the Applicants find any instance where the references of record disclose or suggest a compact availability data set that includes generically indicated free-busy information for the set of attendees as a group, as opposed to free-busy information for individual attendees, as recited in dependent claims 5, 18, and 26. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-30 are patentably distinct over the cited references of record.

Based on the above amendment and remarks, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-30. Favorable action is solicited. The Applicants kindly invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone, facsimile, or email for quickest resolution, if there are any remaining issues.

Respectfully Submitted,  
LEO PARKER, et al.

Date: October 20, 2005

By: /Neil F. Maloney, Reg. No. 42,833/

Neil F. Maloney, Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.34  
Registration No. 42,833  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7607  
Fax: (650) 938-5200